

Weare Conservation Commission
Final Minutes
November 10, 2004

In attendance were: Pat Myers, Tom Carr, Andy Fulton, and Andrea Alderman. Selectman Kurk attended as an observer.

Meeting commenced at 7:12 P.M.

1). Minutes of October 13, 2004 – read by Vice Chair Andy Fulton. Changes included:

- An addition to the “trapping discussion” which Andy volunteered to type and submit to Tina Pelletier.
- In number 4, Robert Richards, add as a final sentence, “The commission voted to accept and sign the application.”
- In file #2004-02432, regarding River Road: The last sentence, change “Consultants” to “Land Services, Inc.”
- In file #141005-01, remove “No *Site Specific Plan* was submitted.”
- In number 7, second sentence, change “hoping the warrant” to “hoping for a warrant”.
- In number 14, first sentence, change “announced” to “asked” and “has been” to “be”.
- Also in number 14, add “All agreed” after the first sentence.
- In number 15, third bullet item, add a third sentence, “Tom Carr stepped down due to involvement in the project.”

Andy made motion to accept the minutes as amended, and Andrea 2nd. All members voted to approve, and the motion carried.

2). Gove Environmental Services and Appledore Engineering – Heather Storlazzi Ward representing Gove Environmental Services and Brad Mezquita representing Appledore Engineering presented the proposed middle school site wetland permit application and proposed mitigation. The highlights of Mr. Mezquita’s presentation are as follows:

- The site is a 42 acre parcel across Route 114 and 77 from the Weare Safety Complex.
- General features of the site: Topography slopes toward Rt. 114; existing ballfields off Quaker St; three existing wetlands systems identified as Impact Areas A, B, and C.
- The proposed project consists of building the new middle school. A significant amount of clearing of the site will take place to provide room to build the school.
- The proposed entrance drive will line up directly across from Center Road and create a 4-way intersection. The proposed entrance drive extends over the property line onto the adjacent property. Discussion is underway with the abutter to provide a land swap.

- The entrance drive circumnavigates the proposed school site to provide drop-off sites for parents in the front of the school and buses in the rear of the school. All drop-off sites will provide direct access to sidewalks for students being dropped off.
- The school will be built into the slope, creating a bi-level building. The front entrance will be on the upper level, while the rear entrance will be to the lower level.
- Proposed athletic fields between entrance drive and the school, to the southeast of the school, consisting of a full-sized soccer field and adjacent baseball/softball field.
- Basketball courts and a playground area are provided for as well on the northwestern side of the school.
- Existing wetlands, impact areas, and replication areas were shown on the exhibit map.
-

The highlights of Ms. Storlazzi Ward's presentation are as follows:

- Wetlands were mapped in the spring of 2004.
- Delineated three main drainages on the wetland impact map as Drainage Area A in the eastern part of the property, Drainage Area B through the center, and Drainage Area C in the western portion. All wetlands on site are Palustrine Forested with a mixture of evergreen and deciduous species (PF01-4E, seasonally saturated). Area A and B, are separate drainages that merge and cross Rt. 114 via a culvert. Area C is made up of an intermittent stream and a hemlock deciduous forested wetland and also crosses Rt. 114. All three wetland areas drain toward Center Brook and ultimately into the Piscataquog River.
- Area A also consists of many "scoured channels", which do not need to meet the three criteria that define wetlands – hydrology, soils, and hydrophytic plants, but is still surface water and, as a result, are the jurisdiction of the state. There are many braided channels throughout the area, so Area A could be inclusive of some upland areas between the channels, which will be evident on the site walk.
- Area A and B are very similar, being characterized by seepage wetlands, groundwater discharge, moderate wildlife habitat, very sparse understory, almost no herbaceous layer, and thick canopy. Canopy species are eastern hemlock, yellow birch, red maple. Area C, the area being proposed for conservation easement, has similar characteristics, with the only difference being an intermittent stream. The upland areas in the conservation area are dominated by deciduous species, mostly beech stands.
- Ms. Storlazzi Ward handed out copies of a site locus map and presented photos of the three wetland areas.
- The proposal is a combination mitigation package. The wetland replication area is 6,626 ft². Similar vegetation will be planted and the grade will be brought down to match the adjacent wetland. In addition, the entire 13.5 acres of Area C will be placed into

conservation easement. The WCC needs to discuss the possibility of holding the conservation easement.

Discussion and Questions:

- Andy: "What time of year were the photos taken?" Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "The wetlands were delineated in late spring, and the photos were taken mid summer, July to August."
- Andy: "Was there water in the stream bed when the photos were taken?" Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "There was water flowing in the late spring but I'm not sure if there was water flowing when the photos were taken." Mr. Mezquita: "It was not flowing last month".
- Tom: "What's the total wetland impact?" Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "1.45 acres."
- Tom: "What's the upland preservation area?" Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "11.62 acres and the wetland included in the easement is 1.93 acres. The impact areas are: Area A, 6,862 ft²; AreaB, the entire wetland 56,311 ft²; Area C, not impacted."
- Pat: "It looks like there would have been room closer to the ball fields to place some of the building without impacting so much wetland." Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "The upland area close to the ball field is proposed for septic. Pat: "The land down below wasn't suitable for septic because it's wet?" Mr. Mezquita: "Because of the wetland setbacks. There is a nitrate setback because of the slope of the land and the flows from the school. The septic has to be located on the upper end." Tom: "With the size of the site, and the slope of the land, the grading would have been over the wetland, even if the school wasn't." Mr. Mezquita: "What drives the site is the location of the entrance, and the grade of the entrance road."
- Tom: "Where is the detention, and where is the water going?" Mr. Mezquita: "Percentage-wise, most of the stormwater will be dealt with via two existing culverts. We also anticipate an underground detention system under the ball field." Andy: "How does an underground detention system function?" Mr. Mezquita: "The plans have not been engineered, but we may use a pipe system to create an underground pond." Andy: "Closed pipes or perforated?" Mr. Mezquita: "The soils are not susceptible as a recharge area, so, it may be better to pull water out, rather than recharging the soil with a perforated system." Andy: "Is Appledore doing the site specific plan?" Mr. Mezquita: "Yes."
- Pat: "Is Area A part of the mitigation area?" Ms. Storlazzi Ward: "No. Area A is being reserved for future development. Their plans for the Area A are not clear, but it is reserved. The only portion that is part of the mitigation is the northwestern side (Area C)." Tom: "They've requested that Area A be retained for future use?" Mr. Mezquita: "They've requested that we not put that area under easement. Our knowledge is that they don't have any particular plans for the area, however, they're going for a land swap." Tom: "They may need that area for the land swap. Is that the old A1 Saw site? Mr. Mezquita:

“Yes.” Tom: “Isn’t that for sale?” Andy: “It is.” Tom: “I believe Draper Energy owns that.”

- Andy: “Why does the area of the replication area not match the extent of the impact area?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “We’re not trying to create the same amount of wetland that we’re impacting. The bulk of the mitigation is through conservation easement and that’s at a 10:1 ratio. For every one unit of wetland you impact, you need to put 10 units into conservation land. We have 13.5 acres in Area C and were short a little bit, so we need to do a replication area to make up the difference.” Tom: “What’s the planting scheme, will you use natives or create a different situation to add more diversity?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “We will use natives, but there’s not a lot of variety now, yellow birch, eastern hemlock, highbush blueberry, winterberry holly.” Andy: “Is it a one time planting, or is it managed wetlands?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “The state typically requires monitoring, which the district would hire a consultant for. Andy: “What does the monitoring entail?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “It’s once or twice per year, depending on the size of the area and, using data plots, monitor for invasive species, and hydrology criteria, monitor the health of the plantings, and make sure it’s functioning as a wetland.” Pat: “What happens if it doesn’t function as a wetland?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “We have to make it work to be in compliance with the permit.” Pat: “How long does the monitoring go on?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “Typically for five years, with a possible exception for three years if it’s doing well.” Pat: “The monitoring is at the expense of the school district?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “Correct.”
- Andy: “Any concerns with ledge in the wetland area or in the construction area?” Mr. Mezquita: “The ledge was deeper than we anticipated, and only a small amount will need to be dealt with for the parking area.”
- Andy: “Is the subsoil predominantly till?” Mr. Mezquita: “It is. The top 30 inches is a glacial till with a much denser till below that.”
- Tom: “How is the cut and fill ratio?” Mr. Mezquita: “It is an export site.” Tom: “Where will the exports go?” Mr. Mezquita: “We haven’t gotten that far in the design yet, but we have calculated it as an export site.”
- Pat: “When is the project projected to begin?” Mr. Mezquita: “The school goes for a bond vote in March. If it’s approved, we will proceed with design drawings. The following spring we would break ground.” Pat: “Spring of 2006.”
- Pat: “What is the current condition of the properties adjacent to the site?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “Possible clearing on the northwestern side.” Mr. Mezquita: “Primarily wooded. Andrea: “What is the ownership like surrounding the property?” Mr. Mezquita: “Two residential owners to the west and south, Draper Energy to the east, town properties, school and safety complex across Rt. 77.”
- Tom: “Do you have verbage for the easement?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “We have draft verbage that’s available on the DES website that we’re

using as a starting point. We need to have the discussion about who will hold the easement and what kinds of activities are going to be allowed. Typically DES allows passive recreation only, which seems suitable for this parcel. Possibly walking trails, and educational opportunities for the students. Obviously no hunting, no ATV use.”

- Andy: “How does the project feel overall, is it similar to other projects you’ve been involved with?” Mr. Mezquita: “It allows for close proximity to Center Woods Elementary school and the safety complex. The topography is a limiting factor in the design of the school. The building was designed to fit the site. The parcel is a good size for the project.”
- Tom: “Is there room for expansion?” Mr. Mezquita: “The school was designed to accommodate more students than are in the district currently.”
- Andy: “How will traffic flow be affected?” Mr. Mezquita: “There will need to be a widening for a right-turn lane into the site, potentially there could be an acceleration lane incorporated.
- Pat: “What happens if they’re unable to negotiate the land swap?” Mr. Mezquita: “Nothing is formalized at this point, but discussions have already taken place.”
- Tom: “Who did the survey?” Mr. Mezquita: “Art Siciliano.” Tom: “Did he locate all the wetland flags?” Mr. Mezquita: “Yes.”
- Pat: “Will there be a well?” Mr. Mezquita: “Yes. A community well.” Andy: “Where will it go?” Mr. Mezquita: “There are a number of options, but within the area that will be cleared for the construction.” Andy: “Will one well be enough?” Mr. Mezquita: “There is a hydrologist looking into that right now – S.W. Cole.” Pat: “What type of well will it be?” Mr. Mezquita: “A bedrock well. It will have to be fairly deep.”
- Pat: “There was a gasoline spill to the east of the property. Will that present a problem?” Mr. Mezquita: “The analysis for the site came back clean. We do know the limits of the spill. It doesn’t affect the site.”
- What will be done on the slope between the school and the existing ballfield?” Mr. Mezquita: “It will be a vegetated slope.” Andy: “Will the ballfield be part of the school?” Mr. Mezquita: “Linking the new proposed fields with the existing fields enhances the site. A central parking area will be available for all fields.”
- What will the strip between the school and Rt. 114 look like?” Mr. Mezquita: “We’re trying to leave some vegetation, particularly the nice trees in that strip. The grading will allow us to do that. A retaining wall would increase the amount of vegetation that could be left, but would cost more.” Pat: “The school will not be visible from Rt. 114, correct?” Mr. Mezquita: “The school will sit upslope of Rt. 114, but will be visible.”
- Andy: “What projects have you worked on in the greater area, as examples of your work?” Mr. Mezquita: “Hooksett Middle and

Memorial, Barrington, Brentwood, Portsmouth – Oyster River, Pelham.”

- Andy: “If the vote is favorable, when will the permit come through?” Mr. Mezquita: “We’d like to have the permit in March, before the vote.” Andy: “When will the permit go to the state?” Ms. Storlazzi Ward: “The application is 85% complete. We’re hoping to submit it in the next couple of weeks.” Tom: “We’ll probably see it at our December meeting.”

A site walk is planned for November 20 at 8:00 am to meet at the Quaker St. ball fields.

3). Wetland Applications - Update

Tom updated the commission on the approval of the following wetland files:

- D.E.S File #2003-02432, Town of Weare, River Road: Approved
- D.E.S File #2004-00967, Michael & Dianne Durgin, 348 Colby Road: Approved

4). Planning Board

- Henry B. & Sharon Lupien and Adam Dick: L.L.A. Fox Hollow Drive, map 89, lots 16 and 17. Purpose is to amend lot line to allow for setback line, acreage of parcels does not change, wetlands impacts do not change. Comment to planning board is, propane tank in the no-cut buffer, move the tank, replant the buffer.
- Michael & Beth Poisson: Condominium Subdivision, 201 Upper Craney Hill Road, map 401 lot 031. Purpose is to convert a triplex of apartments to three condominiums. Comment to planning board is in regard to the wetlands delineation, Audra Clum’s stamp not on plan.

5). Other

Weare Open Space Committee Update

- Review of draft warrant articles: Pat: “in article 1, in 4th line of text, comma after RSA 31:110”. Andy: “in article 2, change “parcel” to “parcels”. Tom stated that the next step after we vote on the warrant articles is for Tom to forward the language of the proposed warrant articles to the BOS along with an outline of topics we wish to address at our presentation to the BOS to update them on WOSC progress. Andy: “What is the reason for designating the parcels in Article 1 as “Town Forest” and the parcels in Article 2 as “Conservation Land”?” Pat: “Steve felt as though it might be more comfortable to the town, if we were going to place multiple parcels into conservation, to have some of them be town forest.” Andrea: “Steve walked the parcels and felt that there was a possibility that the ones that are proposed for designation as town forest could have some timber harvesting on

them. And the way the structure of the town is set up, it appears easier to have timber harvesting on land designated as town forest than land designated as town conservation land.” Tom: “Steve also mentioned that the WCC are the stewards of the town forest.” Andy: “That begs the question of how we can get together with the recognized town forest manager, especially if there are indeed resources in the town forest account. How is that account managed, sounds like we have some responsibility for that.” Tom: “According to Steve, the way the RSA’s are written, we certainly do.” Discussion followed and all agreed that we need to have better communication with the town forest manager. Andy: “There’s a language issue with the articles. We need to change “Shall the town vote...” to “Shall the town approve...”. Selectman Kurk: “There is specific language available from Bob Christensen.”

- **Vote:** Andy made a motion to endorse the warrant articles as edited and with the understanding that we adjust as needed. Pat 2nd and the motion carried.

- Tom announced that the WOSC is not on the agenda for BOS meeting on November 15 due to budgets and a packed agenda. We have been postponed to November 29, 2004 at 7:00pm.
- Selectman Kurk advised that we not refer to WOSC as an *official* subcommittee, because it may indicate authority that the group does not have. The word *recognized* may be a better word. Tom updated Selectman Kurk on the status of the WOSC. Tom thanked Selectman Kurk for her advice and stated that we would not use the word *official* when referring to the subcommittee, but simply refer to WOSC as a subcommittee of the WCC.

Letter from PWA – Tom read the letter addressed to Robert Christensen, dated Nov. 3, 2004. The letter is in regards to PWA’s watershed conservation work and asks for the town’s help in seeking support from NHDES to do the work. PWA’s proposal is to involve volunteers in the assessment of road crossings at streams and the capacity of culverts to pass fish and other aquatic life. Support language is provided in the letter and it’s asked that the BOS act at the November 15 meeting.

- Tom: “The project would focus on culverts that are too small and have a large riparian corridor passing through...culverts that are too flat to allow passage of aquatic life.” Pat: “How small a culvert are they looking at?” Tom: “It’s looking only at roadways, not driveways.” Tom: “PWA will work with Karl on the projection of culvert work and get a list from him on which culverts need to be replaced, so that better alternatives can be looked at when it comes to

replacing culverts. Extra costs would be worked out with BOS.”
Andy: “Is there inference to DES grant money to help replace culverts?” Pat: “I believe that’s what they’re working on, is a grant.”
Tom: “Yes. This is something we’ll likely be involved in, and BOS may ask for our opinion on the project.”

Letter from Piscataquag River Local Advisory Committee – Tom read the letter dated October 25, 2004, addressed to BOS. The purpose of the letter is to reiterate the importance of including the construction of a dam in the Abijah Bridge replacement project in order to protect the Upriver Marsh from the twice yearly water level fluctuations of Horace Lake.

- Tom: “According to Margaret, the funding for the project was not coming together. I assured her that our pledge of \$20,000.00 still stood, should the funding come through.”

Wood Property Cleanup: Andy updated the committee on the cleanup of the Wood Conservation Area. Two dump truck loads and two pickup loads were removed from the site as well as fourteen tires still on the rims. The WCC would like to officially thank Next Generation Auto for donation of their services of removing the tires from the rims so the tires could be brought to the transfer station. Pat stated she would take the tires from Next Generation Auto to the transfer station if needed. Andy proposed that we submit a press release to the Weare Free Press that would serve the dual purpose of thanking Next Generation Auto and inviting the public to visit the newly conserved Wood Conservation Area. Selectman Kurk suggested we write them a thank you note on WCC letterhead. Pat expressed concern that offense could be taken by the Wood family. Andy stated that it is very common for debris to accumulate on large track of land over time. After some discussion, Andy volunteered to reword the press release. He will send the new wording to WCC members for comment.

Annual Meeting of NH Conservation Commissions - Pat was the only WCC member to attend. She reported on a workshop addressing logging on town lands. To prevent future problems on easement properties, two protocols should be in place. First, intent to cut forms should come to WCC on all properties where the town holds an easement. Second, the WCC should be notified when a property transfer occurs on properties where the town holds an easement. Right now intent to cut forms come to Judy Rogers and the BOS signs off on them. Right now the town holds easements on the Kingsbury property and possibly two more. According to Selectman Kurk, the best way to handle this is to speak to Judy Rogers.

Frank Bolton Property Update – Pat spoke to assessor Scot Heath. The assessment will be completed by early December at the latest. The timeline of the project and the possibility of getting a warrant article on the ballot for funding for the project were discussed. Pat mentioned the possibility of using the Town Forest fund for the project and that we need to start getting statements for that account.

6). Adjournment – Andy made motion to adjourn, and Pat 2nd. Since no more business needed to be conducted, all voted in favor of adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 9:38 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrea Alderman (for John Ciampi)

cc: BOS
Town Clerk
Commission Files